

REMARKS

The claims are rejected on the basis of MANN (U.S. Patent 6,314,530) and MAUGHANI (U.S. Patent 5,970,246). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the scope of teachings in the prior art, but to expedite prosecution of this application, applicant has amended, without prejudice, the independent claims to more fully distinguish over the prior art.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite that the specified information includes an "instruction set architecture". Support for this limitation is found in paragraph [1136] among other places. Applicant cannot identify any teaching in MANN or MAUGHANI regarding the specification of an instruction set architecture.

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration of the appropriateness of combining MANN and MAUGHANI. The Examiner maintains that the combination is appropriate in view of MAUGHANI's teachings regarding memory access to various levels. The relevance of this to MANN is unknown, since MANN is directed to "operating systems, and more particularly to an operating system providing on-chip trace support." (Column 1, Lines 13-15) In view of this fact, it is believed that the combination of MANN and MAUGHANI is inappropriate. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, the Examiner is requested to identify a teaching within at least one of the references that suggests the desirability of combining the references.

Thus, in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claim 1 should be in a condition for allowance. Claims 2-6 are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore should also be in a condition for allowance.

Claim 13 is amended to include the instruction set architecture limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claim 13 and its dependent claims 16-18 should also be in a condition for allowance.

Independent claims 19, 20, and 21 are amended to include the instruction set architecture limitation and therefore should also be in a condition for allowance. Claim 22 is dependent upon claim 21 and therefore should also be in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all claims should now be in a condition for allowance. If there are any residual matters that can be resolved through a telephone call, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Dated: **April 3, 2006**

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:

William S. Galliani
Reg. No. 33,885